

44

A  
LETTER  
TO 4,  
Dr. SANGRADO,  
In ANSWER to  
THOMSONUS REDIVIVUS.

WITH  
Some REMARKS on  
THOMSON *Vindicated*.

---

*Sed Stuporem hominis, vel dicam pecudis, attendite.*  
Cic.

---

L O N D O N,  
Printed, and Sold by JACOB ROBINSON, at the  
*Red Lion in Ludgate-Street.*  
( Price Six-Pence. )

A  
LETTER

TO

DR. SAWYER,

In ANSWER to

THOMSON'S REDIVIVUS.

WITH

SOME REMARKS on

THOMSON'S VINDICATION.



Sol. Sturges & Co. Stationers, Strand, London.

Cic.

LONDON.

Printed, and Sold by Jacob Robinson, at the  
Red Lion in Ludgate-Street.  
(Three Six Pence.)



A

# LETTER

TO

DR. SANGRADO, &c.

SIR,

**H**AD not I expected an abler Pen would have been employ'd to answer you, I should have exercised mine before now, in defence of a Gentleman whom you have grossly misus'd without Provocation. The Task is indeed a little difficult. Masters of the Art of Defence have always chose to try their Skill with such as knew how to thrust and parry with  
B                      Dexterity,



Dexterity, rather than engage with a Man who pushes at random, and drives on precipitately, without seeing, hearing or feeling. Such a one is by so much the easier secured from the Attacks of his Antagonist, and the more difficult to be overcome by his Attempts, as he is furious, ignorant and unmeaning.

You set out fir'd with Resentment that Dr. Douglas had taken the *Liberty* to mention your *Name* without any *Respect* to your *Character*, and for pretending to ridicule your and your *Brother Doctor's* (i. e. *Thomson's*) Practice †, on whom, in the *Paroxysm* of your *Fury*, you have vomited forth such a *Heap of Scurrility and personal Abuse*, like the troubled Sea when it cannot rest, but casts forth *Mire and Dirt*. This happy Simile is followed by a short Paragraph equally bright and shining. ‡ *Thus, Sir, half Froth, half Venom you spit yourself abroad*. You then make use of another apt Simile. \* *And as you seem to labour under a Cholera Morbus,*  
*&c.*

† Vide *Thomsonus Redivivus*, Page 3.

‡ Ibidem.

• Ibidem.



*Ec.* and conclude your 4th Paragraph with telling Dr. *Douglas* he ought to be caned: And all this for what? because he took the Liberty of mentioning your Name without any Respect to your Character, &c. How can you expect to have any Respect shewn to your Character, when you have none for it yourself? Is it not ridiculous to style yourself Physician to your own Servant? Where is the Wit or Humour of it? Dr. *Douglas* says nothing of you, farther than comparing you with your Brother *Thomson*, and the Comparison holds good. You practiced the Administration of hot Water and Bleeding in all Cases. Your Brother *Thomson* bleeds, and gives cooling Purges in all Cases. If you must needs make your Appearance in the upper World again, why would you do it at the Expence of Truth, and render yourself still more ridiculous than you ever was before?

BUT You and your Brother *Thomson* (as you with strict Justice may call him) are so like in your Practice and Manner,

and your Works so much of a-piece, that one would be puzzled to find out whether he wrote *Thomsonus Redivivus*, or you Mr. *Winnington's Case*? for in both there is a great Resemblance, and Complaint for want of due *Respect* of *scandalous Slanders*, &c. Now it has been observed, time out of mind, that those generally who deserve *Respect* least, think they deserve, and expect it most; and that those are most affected with Calumny, that are readiest to cast and *propagate scandalous Slanders* on others.

THAT your Brother *Thomson* has been guilty of *asperging* the Characters of many of the Profession, is past all doubt. He has not only behaved in a most rude and unbecoming manner to several of the most eminent Physicians singly, but has thrown his idle Reflections on the whole Body collectively. This you own yourself: *But* you ask, *was there, Sir, any particular Challenge to you?* meaning Dr. *Douglas*. *What could possibly provoke you to take up the Cudgels?* &c. Would not you have

have ask'd the same Question to any one else, that had in your pretty Phrase *taken up the Cudgels* ? There is an old common saying, *What is every-body's Business is no-body's Business*; let that No-body for once be Dr. *Douglas*, for it matters not who the Author is. If what is wrote is to the purpose, it deserves an Answer; it ought not to be beneath your Brother *Thomson*, or any-body to make a Reply, if a Reply can be made. Many Months were elaps'd before your Answer came out; and when the Controversy was judg'd to be at an end, you published your Pamphlet, by which one would have imagined, that, like a Man of Skill, you had retreated to redouble your Force, and secure the Downfall of your Opponent, and so indeed you threaten in your Motto.

*Turno tempus erit, magno cum optaverit emptum*

*Intactum Pallanta.*—————

But behold how weak your Efforts ! you threaten most like Men sensible of their Insufficiency, when most afraid. Af-



AFTER a Profusion of Scurrility and Nonsense, you find fault with the Expression *Physical World*, which I shall not stay now to defend, and, in a Flourish, spread your Plumes and swell out. † *Thus far my Exordium ; wherein if I have the Happiness to recommend myself by the Rotundity of my Periods, and the Propriety of my Diction to a Critick of Dr. Douglas's nice and distinguishing Taste in Style ; I earnestly intreat that Mirror of Science, &c. &c. &c. This wonderful Person I intreat. What would the Reader think Dr. Sangrado so earnestly intreats ? why, not to rob me of the Honour of my Style, &c. &c. This puts me in mind of a Reflection of Mr. de la Bruyere, an excellent Writer, and an excellent Judge of writing. Un Esprit Mediocre croit écrire divinement ; un bon Esprit croit écrire raisonnablement. I will venture to promise no-body will be ever ambitious enough to rob you of the Honour of your Style, the Rotundity of your*

your *Periods*, and the *Propriety* of your *Diction*, of which I have already given a small *Specimen*, and perhaps may *cull* some more of your *Flowers of Rhetorick* before I have done with you. Now, Sir, for *Business*.

Dr. Douglas † *defies* your Brother Thomson to shew any *Authority*, either ancient or modern, to justify the giving *Milk and Milk-Porridge* in an acute *Fever*. ‡ Dr. SANGRADO takes up the *Gauntlet*, and accepts the doughty *Challenge*, and enters the *List*, armed with the *Authority* of SYDENHAM, HARRIS and BOERHAAVE, *Venerable Names* ! Wou'd not the Reader imagine by this pompous *Style*, that DR. SANGRADO was sure of *Victory* ? But let us see how he manages. \* SYDENHAM is brought in to prove that *Milk and Milk-Porridge* is proper in an acute *Fever* ; for he orders three *Parts Water*, and one *Milk*, in an anomalous sort of *Small Pox*, and in an *Hæmorrhage* from the *Nose*.

NEXT,

† Vide a Letter to Dr. Thomson, by W. D———, M. D. Page 9.

‡ Thomsonus Redivivus, Page 11.

\* Idem p. 12, 13.

NEXT, HARRIS is introduced to prove that Milk and Milk-Porridge is proper in an acute Fever. He says, *A Draught of Milk and Water will do Nature good to the very Heart when her Functions are disturb'd, and she pants for burning Heat.*

AND, lastly, BOERHAAVE, amongst his *Diureticks*, p. 138. of his *Materia Medica*, inserts watry Milk, e. g. *three Parts Water, as also skimm'd Milk: and again, p. 139. the same, as proper Drinks in a febrile Thirst.*

HERE are three Authorities, and not one to the Purpose. Dr. Douglas defies Dr. Thomson to shew any Authority, either ancient or modern, to justify him in giving Milk and Milk-Porridge in an acute Fever. And his Champion, Dr. SANGRADO, calls upon three Moderns who do not mention a Word about an acute Fever. And the greatest and best Authority, and most venerable Name! HIPPOCRATES, is only introduced to be confuted by these Moderns, who are entirely silent upon the Subject, on which he plainly



and in few Words decides; for in the 64th Aphorism of the 5th Book, where he mentions in what Diseases Milk is proper and improper, he expressly mentions an *acute Fever*, and forbids Milk in that Case.

*LAC exhibere capite dolentibus malum; malum etiam febricitantibus & quibus Hypochondria sublata obmurmurant, & siticulosi. Malum quoque & quibus biliosæ sunt dejectiones, & ACUTA FEBRE LABORANTIBUS, & quibus copiosi Sanguinis dejectio facta est. At tabidis lac dare convenit non valde admodum febricitantibus, & in febribus diuturnis ac lentis, si prædictorum Signorum nullum adfuerit, & præter rationem extenuatis.*

To produce three Authors who make nothing for, and one that makes flat against you, shews a strange odd Turn of Head. There is a greater Resemblance between you and your *Brother Thomson* than I at first imagined; and I find there is no ridiculing the one, without the same Occasion for ridiculing the other.

**C** To

To give yet a farther Specimen of the *Fullness* and *Pertinency* of your Quotations, you produce SYDENHAM and BOERHAAVE again upon another Head. The Show of Quotations, like the Words of an Empirick, may pass for deep Erudition with the Vulgar, but Men of Sense and Learning examine and value them only as they serve to clear up and illustrate a Subject.

You mention HIPPOCRATES, who proves, *Book the 4th, Aphorism 36, that Sweats are not indiscriminately good.* How does he prove it? Why, he says,

*SUDORES febricitantibus boni, si caeperint 3<sup>o</sup> die, 5<sup>o</sup>. 7<sup>o</sup>. 9<sup>o</sup>. 11<sup>o</sup>. 14<sup>o</sup>. 17<sup>o</sup>. 21<sup>o</sup>. 27<sup>o</sup>. 31<sup>o</sup>. 34<sup>o</sup>. Ii namque sudores morbos indicant. Qui verò non ita prodeunt, laborem, morbi longitudinem, & reversiones significant.*

Is that proving it? Aphorisms are Axioms laid down, not Proofs. But saying and  
I
proving

*proving* is all one to a Man who does not know what is said, or what is proved. You then quote RIVERIUS for what was never deny'd; *Sudor multus in febre acuta apparens eamque non imminuens malus.* But he does not say a Word of *taking a Patient out of Bed, and purging in an acute Fever,*

SYDENHAM, p. 164. where he seems to come nearest to your Purpose, makes nothing for you; *præ Reliquis omnibus edixi ne se in Lectulo assidue continueret; sed illo abstineret bonam diei partem, idque quotidie quando observaverim in hac febre, &c. id est in Febri continua hujus constitutionis, viz. VARIOLOSÆ*: but not a word of *taking out of Bed, and purging in an acute Fever.* SYDENHAM is refer'd to with the same Degree of Judgment, p. 203. BOERHAAVE is introduced to no better Purpose; he talks of the Cause of Sweats in the beginning of an acute Fever, &c. and the Consequence of them. And says, Aphorism 718. Sweats are broke off by bidding the Patient get out of Bed; but



not that the Patient is to be *taken out of Bed or purg'd in an acute Fever.*

But there is one Authority yet behind, an Antient, TRALLIAN. † *I remember, I have ordered purging even in acute Fevers; but such a Practice requires not only much Attention, and exquisite Discernment, but a Physician who is capable of having Courage and Presence of Mind. To which the Doctor (FRIEND) adds, Those who reason upon whatever falls within their Experience, will easily perceive the Force of this Observation; and I believe will own, that in some Cases this Method, when pursued with Judgment, is attended with surprising Success; for often this may be the most proper Way of following or assisting Nature. Physicians know that reasoning in Physick will not always succeed, and Dr. FRIEND himself found, that purging in the secondary Fever of the Small Pox, would not hold good in Practice, tho' it did with him in Reasoning. As to TRALLIAN, the Character Dr. Friend gives of him*

† See Thomsonus Redivivus, p. 19.

him is, that *his Style indeed, in the main, is very good, short, clear, &c. not perfectly elegant, yet very expressive and intelligible; but he was superstitious, and had Faith in Charms and Amulets, &c.* that is, he was an EMPIRICK. Now the Difference between him and a modern EMPIRICK is, that he wrote in an elegant Style, and delivered himself modestly; whereas, a modern EMPIRICK can't write in a common Style, nor deliver himself with common Decency. *Trallian* says, *I have ordered Purging EVEN in acute Fevers; but, &c.* Does not this imply that it was not the Practice of Purging in acute Fevers, which is no more than Dr. *Douglas* means, when he says *no Ancient or Modern ever gave Purges in Fevers; and that he may say still.*

By this time, I doubt the Reader is tir'd with this Dispute; I shall therefore finish it with a Caution out of *Baglivì*, a Direction which (as Dr. *Friend* says of *Trallian*, Page 86, 87.) if all other Writers had as exactly followed, might have been of as much use to us as any of their  
positive

*positive Precepts ; and which will set your Brother Thomson's Practice in a clear Light. In Principiis Februm acutarum cave à purgantibus, cave pariter à remediis nimium volatilibus, & vehementibus ; crudo namque existente adhuc morbo, VEL EDUCES QUÆ EDUCENDA NON SUNT, VEL AUGEBIS FEBRIM, VEL JUGULABIS ÆGROTUM. Baglivi, Page 56. De Febris in genere.* Your Brother Thomson would have done well to have remembered this, and I exhort you both to remember this for the future,

BUT to see how preposterously some People can reason, you remark that BOERHAAVE mentions Scammony as deleterious a Purge as Jalap, in his Form of Purges ; What then ? he neither orders the one or the other in *acute Fevers*. They were both known to be Purges long before BOERHAAVE was born or thought of ; and unless you could *prove* he ordered them in *acute Fevers*, saying Scammony is in his Form of Purges, has nothing to do with the Argument. Just in the same absurd Manner you defend your Method of giving  
hot



hot Water in all Cases. † *Since all Liquors dilute but in Proportion to the Quantity of their aqueous Particles :* and quote as judiciously as you reason, FRIEND, HIPPOCRATES and ALEXANDER, who say nothing about *warm Water being the best Diluter*. Dr. Douglas tells your Brother Thomson his *Reasoning and Quotation are of a-piece*; so indeed are yours. Sure no Ancient or Modern ever wrote like you, and particularly upon a Subject where so little Understanding and Knowledge is required!

I have now done with your Quotations, which when they are cleared of the Rubbish that surrounds them, some make against you, none for you, and all nothing to the Purpose.

THE Reader may now see what sort of Gentlemen Dr. Thomson and his Champion are, and how well they are match'd and suited to one another. I can easily forgive them their more than many Blunders, when

† Thomsonus Redivivus, p. 22.

when it only concerns themselves : but when these choice Pair of Friends would shelter their Ignorance under the Wings of the Ancients, and ingenious and learned Moderns, and impose their own crude and absurd Notions upon the World for theirs; it requires some Animadversion. Dr. SANGRADO, or his Brother *Thomson* (for now they are so closely join'd, that one easily mistakes them both for one) declares, † *That BOERHAAVE lays down a Method of curing all Inflammations indiscriminately by Bleeding and Purging*; which I strongly suspect to be untrue, no where to be found in BOERHAAVE, or any other Writer whatever, either ancient or modern. And had you produced a Quotation, I should have been quite sure of the Falshood and Absurdity of it. As it is, I will pronounce, if BOERHAAVE, or any Writer whatever, lays down a Method of curing all *Inflammations indiscriminately by Bleeding and Purging*, that Dr. *Douglas* is a dull, ignorant, illiterate Scribbler, and Dr. *Thomson* and his Brother Dr. *Sangrado* excellent Writers,

† *Thomsonus Redivivus*, p. 22.

Writers, excellent Physicians, and very worthy honest Men.

AFTER all, there is but one material Objection that can be made to Dr. Douglas's Letter, and that is the Severity of it. You and I have different Notions of Words, and therefore shall never agree about the meaning of *Scurrility*. Every unprejudiced Reader will allow some Liberties a Writer may take, when he is warmed by a proper Occasion for Resentment. The *Greeks* and *Romans*, who were at least as wise, as learned, as good-natur'd and polite as we are, did not restrain their Tongues or their Pens from lashing the Vices, Ignorance and Villanies of their Age.

*Si quis erat dignus describi, quod malus, aut fur,*

*Quod mæchus foret, aut sicarius, aut alioqui*

*Famosus; multa cum libertate notabant.*

I REFER the Reader to the *Roman* Satyrists, where he will find the severest

D

Strokes



Strokes of Satire levell'd at some of the greatest Men in *Rome*, no Fortune, Title or Quality could screen them. They were drawn out at full length, and their Names expos'd. *Nero* himself, as great a Tyrant, and as abandoned a Wretch as he was, felt the sharp Edge of *Persius* without Resentment. And yet so nice and tender were these very *Romans* of Reputation and Character, that a Libel or Lampoon which took away the good Name of a Man, was to be punished with Death by a Law in the twelve Tables.

BUT it may be alledg'd, that Dr. *Douglas's* Expressions are too harsh. *Ignorant, Audacious, Impudence, Assurance, in the compass of five Lines: Pretty Terms for a Physician! a Man of Learning!* Expressions that were not beneath the politest Writer, surely cannot be unbecoming Dr. *Douglas*. To give but a few Instances; *Auguratus petitionem mihi te concessisse dixisti: O Incredibilem Audaciam! O Impudentiam prædicandam!*

Cicero Oratio Philipp. Secunda.

Sit

*Sit hoc inhumanitatis tuæ : stultitiam  
incredibilem videte.* *ibid.*

*O fœditatem hominis flagitiosam ! O  
impudentiam, nequitiam, libidinem non  
ferendam !* *ibid.*

NOW CICERO was at least as polite a  
Writer as Dr. SANGRADO, or his Brother  
*Thomson* ; He was a *Man of Learning* too,  
and a *Philosopher*, tho' no *Physician* ; yet  
he was not tender-mouth'd enough to  
mince the matter, and palliate the Ex-  
pressions ; he thought the Person he ha-  
rangue'd against, deserv'd the severest Treat-  
ment, because he TOLD LYES and ASSUM'D.  
Dr. *Thomson* calls the Physicians : † *Assas-  
sins* and Murderers ; and ASSUMES, with  
a shameful Ignorance, to reform ‡ *the  
Discipline, or Practice of Physic.*

THE Author of *Thomson Vindicated*  
your Coadjutor, breathes the Spirit of  
Mr. *Winnington's Case*. I shall not tire  
myself nor the Reader with following  
him thro' all his Windings and Turnings,

D 2

What

† Mr. *Winnington's Case*, p. 6, 7.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 22.

What he says chiefly may be thrown under three general Heads. *Railings* and *Invectives* against the Faculty, a Defence and Approbation of Dr. *Thomson*, and an Abuse of Dr. *Douglas*, to whom the Public is oblig'd for *Thomson Vindicated*, which had never made its Appearance; but that this † *Vindicator's* Indignation was rous'd, when he was inform'd that this Author struts at Coffee-Houses, and with an Air of Satisfaction receives the Complements of some of the Faculty on his most excellent Performance; with their Congratulations for his wonderful Success.

Now it happens that I am very intimate with *this Author*, and may for that Reason, perhaps, on some occasion, and in some Cases be too much prejudiced in his favour; but with regard to this *Vindicator's* Information, I must do him the Justice to declare that *this Author* (whatever his other Foibles may be) never valu'd himself upon any thing he ever wrote. He wrote to amuse himself, and published

to

† *Thomson Vindicated*. p. 24.



to amuse others. He was very little solicitous about the Business of Reputation as an Author, and therefore did not care in what manner his Trifles were received by the World. Their Approbation never elated, nor their Censure ever dejected him. And now that I have said thus much, I will go a little further, and declare, that tho' *this Author* has a profound Respect and Veneration for several learned and worthy Members of the Faculty, he should despise the Compliments of *some of those Gentlemen* as much as he does Dr. Thomson's Knowledge and Judgment. To proceed :

THE *Vindication* and Mr. *Winnington's* Case are consistent in their *Scurrility*. The *Craft*, that is, the Faculty, are a Parcel of *Assassins* ; they have neither *Charity* nor *Compassion* ; in short, they are made out to be the most ignorant and vilest Set of Men in the Kingdom, and Dr. *Thomson*, the only judicious, honest Man. He \* *honestly sacrifices his own private Interest to the public Good*. The  
Doctor's

\* *Thomson Vindicated*, p. 10.

Doctor's Brethren, who dispense their Medicines to the Croud, *sub fove pluvio in triviis & quadriviis*, talk exactly in the same Strain. There never was a PRETENDER to Physick that did not (to make use of a Phrase of yours) *tickle the Palate*, or rather Ears of the Multitude with such a Speech, which may pass well enough with the Herd; but the World, liable as it is to be imposed on, is at last commonly undeceiv'd. There are few, very few Instances of *Public Spirit* in this degenerate Age. Those who profess it most, are generally found to have least. A Man who HONESTLY *sacrifices his own private Interest to the public Good*, is a *real Patriot*. And I never heard of any Physical Patriots, but the Person who advertises to give Advice for Half a Crown, Dr. *Thomson*, and their Brethren the *Charlatan* Tribe.

I SHOULD pass my intended Bounds, were I to animadvert upon every Passage in *Thomson Vindicated*. *Thomsonus Redivivus*, and that, its Appendix teem with Absurdities, and afford Matter enough to fill

fill a moderate-siz'd Book. The *Vindicator*, as he is † *no Physician*, modestly does not pretend to take upon him to consider or examine how far the *Method of Practice and Discipline in Physic*, contended for by Dr. Thomson, is consistent with the *Laws prescribed by the College*: And therefore very judiciously recommends it to the *Consideration of the Legislature*, who can be supposed to know no more of the matter than himself, for the very same Reason; they are *no Physicians*. After declaring he is *no Physician*, one would be inclined to believe he is, by pretending to give his Opinion of Dr. Thomson's *Treatise of the Gout*; but then he approves it, and calls it an ‡ *excellent Treatise*; he therefore cannot be a Physician, nor I doubt \* *a Man of Sense, and a Scholar*, because if he was either, he must see it is a *Treatise*, without Style, without Sense, without Learning; and which in every respect verifies the old *Greek Proverb*, that *a great Book is a great Evil*.

WHEN

† *Thomson Vindicated*, p. 6.

‡ *Idem*, p. 17.

\* *Idem*, p. 16.



WHEN Dr. *Thomson* obliges the World with two Cases more, I mean that of Mr. *Pope* and Sir *John Eyles*, which he has long promis'd, and I suspect will never perform, † which *would have answer'd* Dr. Douglas's *End as well*; they will be satisfied thoroughly of his Abilities \* *to promote the real Science of Medicine*, if they are not so already.

I HAVE followed your Coadjutor and you thro' a long Scene of Impertinence; you will forgive this short Visit to him. Now I return to you: You have undertaken, with a *magisterial Air, quasi ex Cathedra*, to *exhort* Dr. Douglas; you must not therefore be angry to be *exhorted* in your turn. I *exhort* you to read, conceive and understand an Author before you venture to quote him. I *exhort* you likewise to call People by their proper Names. You call *Alexander Trallianus*, *Alexander of Trallis*. He was born in *Tralle*, a Greek City: and if he must be call'd *Alexander* of any thing, it must be of *Tralle*, and not of *Trallis*. As trifling a Difference as this may

\* *Thomson Vindicated*, p. 18.

† *Ib.* 13.

may seem, it is material, because it serves to show you know no more of the true Names of ancient Authors, than of the true Sense of their Writings. And yet one would think, if you knew any thing, it, must be *Names*, because you deal so much in them : As to Words, you have such a Facility of misunderstanding them, that you do not comprehend the Meaning of the most commonly used. A Dictionary would have help'd you to the Meaning of *World*, and a little Reading would have taught you the different Senses in which it is apply'd. To dispute about Words, is descending very low in a Controversy ; I shall therefore drop both it and you, and conclude with a Word to the *Prosyndic*. I remember *Simo*, in the *Andria*, speaking of the good Qualities of his Son, says of him,

————— *Adversus neminē,  
Nunquam præponens se illis.*

Now Pride and Self-sufficiency are odious and contemptible in a young Fellow ;  
E in

in a Man of maturer Years, they are much more so. The all-knowing *Prosyndic of Padua* is exactly the Reverse of this young Man's Character. He is *adversus OMNIBUS, semper præponens se OMNIBUS*. I exhort him likewise to alter his Conduct,

*Ne nummi pereant, aut pyga, aut denique fama.* Hor.

AND so leaving him and his Two Champions, I remain,

Yours, &c.

F I N I S.

